

*City of San José*

## ***Coyote Valley Specific Plan***

---

### **Summary of Task Force Meeting February 11, 2008 City Hall, Committee Rooms W118-120**

#### **Task Force Members Present**

Co-Chair Councilmember Forrest Williams, Co-Chair Councilmember Nancy Pyle, Supervisor Don Gage, Chuck Butters, Eric Carruthers, Helen Chapman, Gladwyn D'Sousa, Pat Dando, Russ Danielson, Craig Edgerton, Phaedra Ellis-Lamkins, Dan Hancock, Melissa Hippard, Doreen Morgan, Ken Saso, Steve Schott, Jr., Steve Speno, and Neil Struthers.

#### **Task Force Members Absent**

Chris Platten.

#### **Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) Members Present**

Michele Beasley (Greenbelt Alliance), Shanna Boigon (SCCAO Realtors), Dawn Cameron (SCC Roads), Marisa Espinosa (JOB/Caltrain), Mike Griffis (SCC Roads), Jane Mark (SCC Parks & Recreation), Jennifer Rodriguez (Home Builders Assoc.), Brian Schmidt (Committee for Green foothills), and Tim Steele (Sobrato Development).

#### **City Staff and Other Public Agencies Present**

Jessica Garcia-Kohl (Mayor's Office), Ruani Weerakoon (Mayor's Office), Anthony Drummond (Council District 2), Lee Wilcox (Council District 10), Rachael Gibson (Office of Supervisor Don Gage), Wayne Chen (Housing), Maria Angeles (Public Works), Joe Horwedel (PBCE), Laurel Prevetti (PBCE), Sal Yakubu (PBCE), Darryl Boyd, (PBCE), Susan Walsh (PBCE), Jared Hart (PBCE), Stefanie Hom (PBCE), Regina Mancera (PBCE), and Perihan Ozdemir (PBCE).

#### **Consultants Present**

Doug Dahlin (Dahlin Group), Ken Kay (Ken Kay Assoc.), Roger Shanks (Dahlin Group), John Hesler (David J. Powers), Jodi Starbird (David J. Powers), Darin Smith (EPS), and Bill Wagner (HMH Engineers).



**Community Members Present** (Additional people were present; however, the names below only reflect individuals who identified themselves on the sign-up sheet.)

Jeremy Barousse, Julie Ceballos, Roger Costa, Frank Crane, June Crane, Consuelo Crosby, Jo Crosby, Richard DeSmet, Leatha Dewitt, Robert Eltgroth, Leila Forouhi, Dorothy Hinze, Jack Kuzia, Joanne McFarlin, Peter Mandel, David Marsland, Mark Anthony Mederios, Susan Ortho, Georgene Petri, George Reilly, Jennifer Ralston, Peter Rothschild, Kiley Russell, Annie Saso, Pete Silva, Robert Snively, Chris Trubridge, Marshall Torre, Paul Turner, Al Victors, Jesse Votaw, Don Weden, and Rachel Wilken.

## **1. Welcome**

The meeting convened at approximately 5:30 p.m. with Co-Chair Councilmember Forrest Williams welcoming everyone to the Coyote Valley Specific Plan (CVSP) Task Force meeting.

## **2. Acceptance of Meeting Summaries**

- a. Task Force Meeting January 14, 2008**
- b. Property Owner Meeting January 31, 2008**
- c. Technical Advisory Committee Meeting February 6, 2008**
- d. Community Meeting February 7, 2008**

Co-chair Councilmember Forrest Williams called for a motion to accept the January 14, 2008 Task Force Meeting summary, the January 31, 2008 Property Owner Meeting summary, the February 6, 2008 Technical Advisory Committee Meeting summary, and the February 7, 2008 Community Meeting summary. The motion passed unanimously.

There was a motion to reverse agenda item #3, review of the CVSP work program, and item #4, selection of preferred CVSP Plan Refinement. The motion passed unanimously.

## **3. Selection of Preferred CVSP Plan Refinement Approach (previously agenda item #4) – Sal Yakubu, Principal Planner with the City of San Jose Department of Planning, Building and Code Enforcement, Doug Dahlin with Dahlin Group, and Ken Kay with KenKay Associates**

The Task Force provided the following comments and questions:

- Why don't the roads go straight through the center of Coyote Valley? *Doug indicated that Staff considered it, but it would bring traffic too close to the core area. In addition, it would require changes to the entitled street network.*
- The South County Circulation study indicates that traffic is congested. The Plan cuts off Santa Teresa Boulevard; it would force traffic back onto U.S. 101. *Doug indicated that Coyote Creek Parkway is meant to help alleviate traffic.*



- Traffic would spill over onto the side streets.
- Santa Teresa is the only thorough street existing in Coyote Valley, but the CVSP would replace it with two through streets. Monterey Road would be improved. Demand would be reduced by placing housing and jobs closer in, rather than farther out.
- The Task Force needs to be clear on their vision. There are still outstanding issues that need to be discussed. Do not want to make adjustments that are not consistent with the Task Force vision.
- Unclear where the entitlements are. *Sal reviewed the locations of the existing entitlements.*
- If areas that were designated high-rise residential change into another land use, would housing be made up elsewhere? *Doug indicated that the Plan needs to maintain 25,000 housing units, and some land use designations may change to accommodate that.*
- Does the Task Force need to pick a plan concept tonight? *Sal indicated that staff would like the Task Force's concept preference. In order to accomplish goals in a timely manner, staff would like a decision on the project description tonight.*
- No concept preference. Need to discuss the work program. Do not see the EIR being completed by end of year reflected in the work program. Concerned that the Task Force is looking at refinements without being prepared on other issues.
- Have not given up anything from the original plan, just making some adjustments for existing entitlements. The Task Force cannot change triggers, only make recommendations regarding them.
- Discussion of the work program was originally scheduled first, however some Task Force members needed to leave early, so the agenda was changed. *Sal indicated that the plan refinement concepts adhere to the same criteria as the previous plan. The concepts reflect refinements based on comments received.*
- Why weren't existing entitlements considered earlier in the process? *Sal indicated that existing entitlements were discussed early in the process. Everyone thought we were going in the right direction, but later staff received information that the existing entitlements had to be looked at more carefully to ensure that the Plan could be implemented.*
- What are the land uses associated with the existing entitlements? *Sal indicated the existing entitlements are for workplace use.*
- The main difference between the original plan and the new plan is that there is workplace around lake. *Concept 1b includes workplace around the lake.*
- Like integrating jobs with the lake and park, and not squeezing it in after the fact.
- The existing entitlements need to be respected. A lot has occurred in North Coyote prior to the Task Force being assembled and prior to the initiation of the specific plan. The entitlements provide local and regional benefits. The CVSP provides better opportunities for a mixed used, pedestrian-oriented community. There are opportunities for San Jose and CVRP to work together to explore transition from the Coyote Valley Research Park (CVRP) entitlements to CVSP. But since there is no plan approved today, the existing entitlements need to be respected.
- Commends staff on efforts on the east of Monterey Road.
- Favors Concept #1, which includes mixed use. There is the ability to transition from existing entitlements to CVSP.
- Commends staff on all of the refinement concepts.



- Need to respect the fact that the Task Force is only a recommending body. A lot of decisions will be made beyond the Task Force.
- A lot of money has been spent on infrastructure, but there is still congestion.
- Cannot reach goals of a pedestrian-oriented plan if there is a lot of free parking. *Doug indicated there would be Transportation Demand Management (TDM) measures, which may include parking fees that would supplement transit and reduced parking ratios. Since the Plan is dense, there would be structured parking and minimal surface parking.*
- Frustrated that staff did not address existing entitlements earlier in the process. Has staff worked with the entitlement holders on the proposed concepts? *Sal indicated that staff has reached out to the property owners with the entitlements as well as other property owners and various other stakeholders.*
- Concerned as to how the triggers will be met. Need to accommodate entitlements so they can provide jobs. Is there one concept that would bring jobs? *Sal indicated that Concept #1 includes mixed uses on west and north side of lake. Concept #1b includes the current Planned Development zoning for industrial development on the west side of the lake. This concept truncates lake, and there is more frontage along Santa Teresa Boulevard. Concept #1b allows early development in areas north of Bailey Avenue.*
- Concept #1 includes a significant amount of housing. Would that create problems in converting existing entitlements to housing? *Sal indicated that the only difference between Concept #1 and #1b are the land uses on the property west of the lake.*
- Which of the concepts accommodates the existing entitlements? *Concept #1b. Concept #3 also accommodates existing entitlements, but the lake is configured differently.*
- Concerned about the wildlife corridor. There needs to be a way to maintain the wildlife corridor, and build the plan. Would like a meeting to discuss wildlife corridor alternatives. *Darryl indicated that there are on-going discussions about the wildlife corridor. Staff is going to meet with Tanya Diamond, who is researching the wildlife corridor.*
- Entitlements seem to be locked in. If entitlements cannot be changed, what is the point in looking at the wildlife corridor?
- If entitlements need to change, there are ways that can be negotiated.
- There are implications that the entitlements are absolute.
- Concept # 1b was not presented at the property owners meeting. But there was unanimous agreement in favor of Concept #1 at that meeting. The entitlements are important. The Plan would be easy if it was on public property, but it is private, so this plan needs to respect that.
- Some people do not want Coyote Valley developed because they want to keep the traffic flow. Property owners have development rights. Coyote Valley should not be required to solve regional problems. It is privately owned land.
- These discussions should have happened years ago. Back then, there was a wide open budget. Now concerned about the budget. The entitlements should have been addressed from the beginning.
- Not prepared to make a decision on the concepts. The entitlement holders should make the decision.
- There is some flexibility with entitlements, but it is expensive and could involve lawsuits.
- CVRP is willing to work with staff on a new set of entitlements. CVRP likes Concept #1, since it is similar to the existing entitlements. The entitlements should not be a surprise.



CVRP reminded the Task Force about them. But going back to the 1980's plan that is entitled would be a step backwards, so the concepts are worth the effort.

- Cannot support any of the plan concepts. The EIR indicated there are significant issues that need to be addressed.
- The Plan may take a long time to implement, and the existing entitlements may develop in the meantime. Concept #1 is the best alternative. It is the most consistent with the original vision, while incorporating the entitled street network. Recommend reconfiguring the lake to get more frontage on Santa Teresa Boulevard.
- Supports Concept #1; it would create a good sense of community. Concept #1b would be a dead-zone at night. Concept #1 would be a plan with less infrastructure.
- The EIR raised significant issues that are not dealt with in these concepts. Need sustainable elements in the Plan.
- There was an assumption that the existing entitlements were considered and that the property owners supported the Plan. There have been no objections from the property owners in the past five years. The property owners need to figure out what they want.
- The issue of the wildlife corridor came up five years ago and then disappeared. The animals have been there all this time so why hasn't this issue been taken into consideration?
- The Plan would produce less greenhouse gases than low density development.
- The concept alternatives need to address water. Need to see what the purpose of lake is besides flood control. The lake should be an amenity surrounded by higher densities. Need mixed use around edges of the lake rather than employment. Need an alternative between Concept #1 and #1b that keeps mixed uses around the edge of the lake.
- Wants to vote on the preferred concept so staff knows what needs to be done.
- Cannot support any concept, unless they know when the "ball is going to stop spinning".
- Concept #1 is counter productive to put industry on west edge of the lake (3 people in support).
- Concept #1c (a hybrid) would be based on Concept #1b, but would include mixed uses at the edge of the lake.

A vote was taken on the concepts presented. There was a motion to use Concept #1 for the project description, and Concept #1b as the alternative. *(Nine Task Force members voted in support of the motion, three opposed, and two abstained.)*

There was a subsequent motion to consider Concept #1c which would be based on 1b, but would retain mixed use on the west side of the lake backed up by industrial. *(Eleven Task Force members voted in support, two opposed, and one abstained.)*

#### **4. Detailed CVSP Work Plan (previously agenda item #3) – Susan Walsh, Senior Planner, and Darryl Boyd, Principal Planner, with the City of San Jose Department of Planning, Building and Code Enforcement**

The Task Force provided the following comments and questions:



- There are a number of issues that have not been addressed that are not included in the work program. *Staff indicated that some topics, such as phasing, are almost completed. The financing strategy will be discussed sometime in April.*
- Need to find ways to expedite the EIR. Staff is working with environmental experts to make sure the EIR is best it can be, so we do not need to go through this process again.

## **5. Public Comments**

- Susan Oath indicated that the EIR is not being looked at seriously. Land owners should not be able to develop without looking at environmental impacts. The wildlife corridor should be looked at before there is development. There are a lot of problems with water. Taxpayers should not carry the burden of building a “fantasy city”.
- Joanne McFarlin indicated that the California Department of Fish and Game and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service want to maintain wildlife connectivity in Coyote Valley. The Santa Clara County Habitat Conservation Plan indicates that a wildlife corridor exists. Happy to hear that Staff is working with Tanya Diamond, but they should also work with other experts.
- Mark Anthony Mederios, representing Save Coyote Valley, indicated that the Plan ignores public comments about the wildlife corridor. Should preserve Coyote Valley. The Task Force is supposed to represent the citizens. Need to tell the City Council and Santa Clara County Supervisors that this is a bad plan.
- Brian Schmidt, representing Committee for Green Foothills, commended staff for scheduling other public meetings prior to this one. The Task Force should have considered public comments before taking votes on the preferred concept. There is no mention of the revision of the draft fiscal analysis in the work program. Need to know which fiscal analysis to review.
- Donna Wallach, representing Save Coyote Valley, indicated that the Plan is destructive. Animals and plants need Coyote Valley and it is their home. Land in Coyote Valley belongs to two indigenous tribes. Should leave their sacred land alone. There needs to be an option to stop the Plan.
- Jennifer Ralston, a DeAnza College student, indicated that the Plan displays little consideration for wildlife. The Plan would separate the two mountain ranges, forcing animals to inbreed, causing damage to them.
- Erica Stanojevic indicated that just because the process has gone on for so long, it does not make the Plan good. It is difficult to leave something that has been worked on for so long, but the right thing to do is to stop the process. There is public opinion that the Plan is bad. There is a need for untouched land. San José needs to redevelop up, not out.
- Richard DeSmet, a property owner, indicated the Plan is good. But time is running out and existing entitlements are going to develop. Wants to move forward and approve the original plan. There was 100% vote in favor Concept #1 at the property owners meeting.
- Consuelo Crosby, a property owner in the Greenbelt, would like more information about the Greenbelt. Encouraged people to visit the Greenbelt. She has land for sale, but cannot sell it.



- Jo Crosby, a property owner in the Greenbelt, was told that the Greenbelt would be used for agricultural uses, but agriculture does not flourish in the Greenbelt. Would like to see how the Greenbelt would be preserved as open space. Would like some return on the land so they are not subsidizing the City of San Jose.
- Robert Snively indicated that the County does not permit permanent structures in the Greenbelt, but the ball-fields have been relocated there. Would need to walk across the field to use restrooms. The refinements show that the lake would be blocked by workplace. Would like staff and CVRP to work together to restore the original spirit of plan and create a livable community.
- David Marsland, a DeAnza College student representing Sierra Club Cool Cities, The Greenbelt Alliance, opposes development in Coyote Valley. In 1999, the Sierra Club and Greenbelt Alliance tried to sue the City to stop development of CVRP, and Mayor Chuck Reed was against development of Coyote Valley. Need to scale back the Plan. The wildlife corridor cannot be removed. DeAnza College students have proven it is a significant wildlife corridor. Need to listen to public comments and preserve Coyote Valley.
- Leila Forouhi indicated that the City and area is not prepared to absorb development of this magnitude. ABAG projects the population in Santa Clara County would increase by 2-million people by 2035. Traffic on U.S. 101 would only get worse. The City should do infill and transit-oriented development. How does the Plan relate to the City's green vision?
- Shanna Boigon, representing Santa Clara County Association of Realtors (SCCAOR), likes the Plan. Should coordinate with environmental groups to mitigate the wildlife corridor. Santa Teresa Boulevard not going through Morgan Hill is a problem, but the Plan should try to make it work. The Plan is not going to happen overnight, but it would be in place when it is time to develop.
- Paul Turner indicated that it is important to complete the EIR before breaking ground. Should save as much of Coyote Valley as possible. Scaling back the Plan would create a community that people would be proud of. The lake does not need to break up Santa Teresa Avenue. Enjoys the drive through Bailey Avenue and Santa Teresa Boulevard. Putting homes down there is going to change the area. Is the area going to be bike-friendly?
- Julie Ceballos indicated that the entitlements need to be honored. But need to understand and respect the environmental science of the project. Appreciates comments from the Task Force.

## **6. Adjourn**

Co-chair Councilmember Forrest Williams thanked everyone for coming to the Task Force meeting.

He adjourned the meeting at approximately 8:15 p.m.

The next Task Force meeting will take place on April 14, 2008, from 5:15 to 7:30 p.m.